UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

HONG WANG,

Plaintiff,

v. 1:18-CV-350 (FJS/DJS)

PRECISION EXTRUSION, INC. and PEXCO, LLC,

Defendants.

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL

MELTZER, LIPPE, GOLDSTEIN ASISH NELLUVELY, ESQ.

& BREITSTONE, LLP 190 Willis Avenue Mineola, New York 11501 Attorneys for Plaintiff

FITZGERALD MORRIS BAKER JOHN D. ASPLAND, ESQ.

FIRTH, P.C. 68 Warrant Street Glens Falls, New York 12801 Attorneys for Plaintiff

BARCLAY DAMON LLP BRIENNA L. CHRISTIANO, ESQ.

80 State Street Albany, New York 12207 Attorneys for Defendants

MONACO COOPER LAMME & ADAM H. COOPER, ESQ. CARR, PLLC

1881 Western Avenue, suite 200 Albany, New York 12203 Attorneys for Defendants

NELSON MULLINS GREGORY MICHAEL O'NEIL, ESQ.

201 17TH Street NW Suite 1700 Atlanta, Georgia 30363 Attorneys for Defendants MARTIN, HARDING & MAZZOTTI, LLP

MATTHEW J. DILLON, ESQ.

1 Wall Street Albany, New York 12205 Attorneys for Defendants

BESTPASS, INC.

WILLIAM J. DECAIRE, ESQ.

500 New Karner Road, Suite 5 Albany, New York 12205 Attorneys for Defendants

SCULLIN, Senior Judge

ORDER

Plaintiff filed her complaint against Defendants on March 20, 2018. *See* Dkt. No. 1. In a Memorandum-Decision and Order dated June 26, 2018, this Court, among other things, dismissed Plaintiff's Fourth, Sixth, Eighth, Tenth, Twelfth, and Fourteenth Causes of Action, all of which were based on alleged violations of New York Executive Law and found that, because Plaintiff's First, Second, Third, Fifth, Seventh, Ninth, Eleventh, Thirteenth, and Fifteenth Causes of Action were subject to mandatory arbitration pursuant to Section 17 of Plaintiff's Employment agreement, those claims must proceed through arbitration. *See generally* Dkt. No. 31.

Defendants now petition the Court pursuant to the Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. § 9 (the "FAA") to confirm an Arbitration Award and Decision dated April 24, 2020, in which the Arbitrator dismissed all claims of discrimination, hostile work environment and retaliation that Plaintiff Hong Wong had brought against Defendants under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, 29 U.S.C. § 621, and 42 U.S.C. § 1981, and ordered relief on other related arbitration claims between the parties as fully described in the Award and Decision. *See* Dkt. No. 43. Plaintiff did not file any papers in opposition to Defendants' motion.

Case 1:18-cv-00350-FJS-DJS Document 44 Filed 01/26/22 Page 3 of 3

"[T]he confirmation of an arbitration award is a summary proceeding that merely makes

what is already a final arbitration award a judgment of the court." New York City Dist. Council

of Carpenters Pension Fund v. Par Flooring Co., No. 04 Civ. 8486 RJH, 2005 WL 525451, *1

(S.D.N.Y. Mar. 3, 2005) (quoting Florasynth, Inc. v. Pickholz, 750 F.2d 171, 176 (2d Cir.

1984)). Pursuant to § 9 of the FAA, "upon timely application by any party, a court must grant an

order to confirm an arbitration award unless the award is vacated, modified, or corrected as

prescribed in §§ 10 and 11 of the FAA." *Id.* (citing *Marsillo v. Geniton*, No. 03 Civ. 2117

(TPG), 2004 WL 1207925, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. June 1, 2004)).

In this case, Defendants petitioned the Court to confirm the arbitration award on April 23,

2021, within one-year of the date of the arbitration award as § 9 of the FAA requires.

Furthermore, none of the parties to the award made an application to vacate, modify or correct

the Award and Decision and the time do so has expired. See 9 U.S.C. § 12. Finally, Plaintiff did

not oppose Defendants' motion to confirm the arbitration award within the time she was required

to do so. Accordingly, the Court hereby

ORDERS that Defendants' motion to confirm the arbitration award in all respects, see

Dkt. No. 43, is **GRANTED**; and the Court further

ORDERS that the Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment in favor of Defendants and

close this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 26, 2022

Syracuse, New York

Senior United States District Judge

Seuller